DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 941 TM 030 194

AUTHOR Kennett, Carol L.
TITLE Trust at the Threshold: Negotiating New Pathways for Methods Instruction.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Methods Courses; Organizational Theories; *Partnerships in Education; *Teacher Education; *Trust (Psychology)

ABSTRACT

Using some recent studies of trust done by scholars in organizational science and related fields, this paper attempts to identify models and constructs that could prove useful to educators looking for ways to encourage successful collaborative partnerships, especially those that include processions from K-12 and university settings. The paper examines the social organization of trust and describes the ecological arrangements within which trust occurs (or does not occur) in the context of school/university collaborations. The study looks at the relationships among the social actors in a partnership that connects the faculty, staff, and students of a large public high school with the instructor and students involved in a general methods course (n=16) at a small, private, liberal arts college. Findings suggest that a predisposition to trust, responsibility in following through with one's obligations, and a willingness to allow for minor indiscretions provide a basis for increased cooperation and further development. The study also highlights the rich body of literature on trust that is being produced by theorists in the organizational sciences. (Contains 55 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Carol Kennett
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 434 941

Trust at the Threshold: Negotiating New Pathways for Methods Instruction

Carol L. Kennett, Ph.D.

School of Education
Trinity International University
Deerfield, Illinois 60015

(847) 317-7163
ckennett@tiu.edu

TM030194

Paper presented at the session titled,
"Sharing the Stories: Teacher/Faculty Relationships in Professional Development Contexts"
at the American Educational Research Asssociation Annual Meeting
Montreal, April 19-23, 1999

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Trust at the Threshold:
Negotiating New Pathways for Methods Instruction

Carol L. Kennett
Trinity International University

Researchers in such varied fields as psychology, medicine, education, anthropology, and political science allude to the centrality of trust in the development of a healthy personality and a smoothly running organization. Despite such widespread interest and the tacit assumption that trust relationships are necessary to effective and efficient performance, scholars in these fields have found it difficult to agree on the actual development of trust, especially as it occurs between individuals of differing ages, status, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Furthermore, while there appears to be agreement concerning the importance of trust relationships in educational settings, few educators attempt to define what they mean by "trust" or describe how they distinguish between its presence and absence in inner-school and inter-school relationships. Within the field of business, however, considerable energy and effort has been expended to define, refine, and bring clarity to the concept of trust and to its importance and its development in a wide variety of organizational settings and market economies. This work, which has been expanding greatly over the past few years, offers educators important insights into the genesis of trust and the key role that it plays as a foundation for effective collaboration and cooperation among individuals, groups, and organizations.

Utilizing some of the most recent studies of trust done by scholars in organizational science and related fields, this paper attempts to identify models and constructs which could prove useful to educators looking for ways to encourage successful collaborative partnerships, especially those which include professionals from both K-12 and university settings. Specifically, it examines the social organization of trust and describes the ecological arrangements within which trust occurs (or does not occur) in the context of school/university collaborations. The study looks at relationships among the various social actors in a fledgling partnership that connects the faculty, staff, and students of a large, public high school with the instructor and students involved in a general methods course offered by a small, private, liberal arts college in the mid-west.

The paper also seeks to describe both the surface production and the constructed meaning of educational trust relationships by asking: How do high school teachers understand and respond to their role in the current development of school/university partnerships? What factors appear to foster increased cooperation, involvement, and creative initiatives by the teachers? Conversely, what factors appear to inhibit cooperation and limit the involvement and production of creative initiatives? How do each of the participants view the newly developing relationships and understand the outcomes of the collaborative project? Where and in what circumstances does the concept of trust enter into the participants' reflection on and evaluation of the project? How do school and university faculties, staff, and students understand their place in the complex web of relationships that result from such collaboration? How do they make sense of the tensions and stress (both positive and negative) that result from such complexity?

The Professional Development School

Professional collaboration between K-12 schools and teacher education programs in colleges and universities has evidenced significant increase since the mid-1980s. In some cases, this

collaboration has led to the development of an exclusive and highly structured partnership suggested by the work of the Holmes Group (1990) and other theoreticians (Goodlad, 1988; Duffy, 1994; Teitel, 1997; Levine, 1997) known as a professional development school (PDS). The primary purpose of these schools is two-fold: to improve the quality of teacher education programs while at the same time contributing to the positive reform of schooling for children in K-12 schools. Models for these schools range from "symbiotic partnerships" (Goodlad, 1988), to "organic collaboration" (Schlechty & Whitford, 1993), to the "collaborative school" defined by Million and Vare (1997) as a place where faculty, drawn from both the K-12 and university settings, function as equal status partners, jointly sharing instructional, administrative, and research responsibilities.

As the number of such partnership schools has grown, various teacher organizations have begun to focus on these collaborations and to consider their role in the reform of teacher education. Among such organizations is the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) which is currently in the process of developing a set of draft standards that describe the stages of development and characteristics of successful PDSs (NCATE, 1997). Their document reflects the findings of many recent studies which examine the development and ongoing collaboration within PDSs and similar school/university partnerships. These studies cite as significant such relatively common sense issues as establishment of a common purpose and use of incentives (Clemson, 1990), the importance of constant dialogue and shared decision making (Bercik, 1991), the existence of "true collaborative activities" (Francis, 1992), the involvement of administration and the role and availability of clinical professors and other university staff (Crawford, 1993; Stump, 1993), the equalization of power relationships (Lewison & Holliday, 1997), and an "understanding of what it (is) like to be 'on the other side," (Morgan, 1997). Selke (1996) focused her study of the cultural analysis of school-university partnerships around an assessment tool, the SPIR Model, which examines factors seen to either help or hinder collaborative partnerships in terms of stakes, power, interest interdependence, and readiness for trust.

This final factor, trust, appears as a common denominator in the literature cited above and is referred to repeatedly in similar studies as essential, and perhaps even foundational, for the successful development of professional partnerships (da Costa, 1993, 1995; da Costa & Riordan, 1996; Riordan & da Costa, 1996). Ttust is also mentioned in the current NCATE draft standards for identifying and supporting quality Professional Development Schools, standards that outline three stages of PDS development: pre-threshold, threshold, and quality attainment. In describing the pre-threshold stage, the document suggests that this level of collaboration supports "the development of important relationships and trust among participants, which is necessary in order for the Threshold Conditions to be effective." Later high stakes commitments at the Threshold stage "typically rely on relationships built prior to the partnership."

The Literature of Trust

As mentioned above, the series of studies focusing on various learning partnerships in education foreground trust as a construct, but evidence very little clarity or consensus as to what is meant by the term. Trust is frequently coupled with the words "shared goals" and "mutual respect" (da Costa, 1995; Riordan, 1995; Thorkildsen & Stein, 1996), with "rapport" (Wiedmer, 1995), with equalizing power and maintaining communication (Lewison & Holliday, 1997), with

timeliness, mutuality, and results (Smith & Auger, 1986; Higgins & Merickel, 1997), and with making a personal and professional commitment (Chevalier, 1994). Trust building is seen as an essential skill that educators need for working together (Rothberg, 1984; Heil, 1986; Bercik, 1991a; Ferris, 1994; De Boer, 1995), but few authors attempt to delineate the factors involved in this process.

In many cases trust in educational relationships appears to be intuitively valued. Noddings (1988) couples trust development with the moral value of caring, asserting that teachers and students should together model, dialogue about, practice, and confirm an ethic of caring in the classroom. As a result of these behaviors, Noddings and others (Martin, 1992; Deiro, 1996) believe trust will develop.

Trust is treated to a much more nuanced and rigorous examination within the organizational sciences, a field in which systematic research on trust has been conducted for over 40 years (Mellinger, 1956; Deutsch, 1958). Contemporary researchers in this field view the development and maintenance of trust relationships essential to such business practices as managerial relations (McAllister, 1995; Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard & Werner, 1998; McKnight, Cummings & Chervany, 1998), business law (Koehn, 1996), customer service and marketing (Cowles, 1997), transaction cost economics (Bigley & Pearce, 1998), interpersonal cooperation and teamwork (Jones & George, 1998), and strategic alliances (Das & Teng, 1998). Numerous attempts to articulate and refine a definition of trust reflect the importance given to the concept.

Acknowledging the varied disciplinary perspectives from which trust has been viewed, a number of theorists have attempted to integrate multiple conceptualizations of trust into a single, workable definition and to create a model which describes the outworking of trust in the complex interdependencies reflective of today's global economy (Das & Teng, 1998; Jones & George, 1998; Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998; Sheppard & Sherman, 1998). Among the most-cited early definitions of trust is Rotter's (1971: 444, 1980: 1) "a generalized expectancy held by an individual or group that the word, promise, verbal, or written statement of another individual or group can be relied on." This definition views trust as a relatively stable personality characteristic and one in which vulnerability is a key element. Later theorists have proposed additions to improve the precision and specificity of our understanding of the term "trust," one which is able to incorporate trust as it is experienced in institutional as well as individual contexts.

Bhattacharya, Devinney & Pillutla (1998) synthesize several themes in the existing research to define trust as "an expectancy of positive (or nonnegative) outcomes that one can receive based on the expected action of another party in an interaction characterized by uncertainty" (p. 463). In this definition, the authors underscore the belief that an understanding of trust must include risk, predictability, mutuality, "goodness," and an awareness of its strength and importance within specific contexts.

Koehn (1996) also looks at popular definitions of trust and questions their accuracy, completeness, and utility. He sees trust as more than a strictly interpersonal phenomenon and is concerned about the tendency to equate "trust" with "cronyism" whereby only those individuals who share values and norms can be said to truly trust. This leads to another concern related to the normative issues assumed in trusting. Are all occurrences of trusting behavior to be viewed

as "good?" "Perhaps authentic trust – i.e., trust that expects ongoing good will – presupposes trustors who are self-critical, who value disagreement, and who are willing to consider whether they are acting in a manner consistent with continuing relations" (p. 184). Koehn goes on to explore five possible strategies for engendering trust, only two of which he sees as leading towards the development of "ethically good trust." Of these two, the "Strategy of Office-Based Trust" rests in the protection of professional codes of ethics, and the "Strategy of Trusting as a Matter of Policy" hearkens back to the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi who affirmed the wisdom of trusting others, often regardless of their perceived lack of trustworthiness, as the way to open a connection which might then lead to further opportunities for understanding and eventual development of mutual trust.

The challenge to initiate trust is examined from a somewhat different perspective by Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and Werner (1998). Focusing on the antecedents of "managerial trustworthy behavior," the authors examine both agency theory, with its focus on control, and social exchange theory, with its focus on voluntary exchange of benefits. It is here that Whitener, et al. support Koehn's (1996) position. Within business relationships, they maintain, it is the manager's responsibility to make the preemptive move towards trusting her subordinate, believing that so doing will create an organizational culture in which the frequent conflicts between self-interest and the collective good are mitigated through reciprocal trust relationships.

Summarizing the frequently stated concern on the part of psychologists, sociologists and economists related to the lack of consensus on the meaning of trust, Bigley and Pearce (1998) propose a typology designed to provide organizational scientists with a means of understanding and thus utilizing the voluminous trust literature. Their categorization system gathers the work on trust into three subsections: 1). Interactions among unfamiliar actors; 2). Interactions among familiar actors; and 3). Organization of economic transactions (a structural perspective emanating from the transaction cost economics tradition). Most pertinent to the current study is the section on interactions among unfamiliar actors, with its focus on dispositional theories of trust. These theories assert that those individuals who have successfully completed the basic task of developing a sense of trust in self, others and the world (Erikson, 1959), are thus equipped to enter an unfamiliar situation with the ability to choose to employ initial trust behaviors. In many cases, these individuals also exhibit a rational decision to trust in the short term based on an expectation of long-term rewards for cooperative behavior. Bigley and Pearce quote Shapiro's (1987) definition of trust as "a social relationship in which principals – for whatever reason or state of mind – invest resources, authority, or responsibility in another on their behalf for some uncertain future return (p. 626).

However individuals may come to the initial decision to trust, it still remains to further consider the unique experience of trust, its meaning for both the trustor and the trustee, and the process whereby trust evolves in organizations. Jones and George (1998) approach these issues from a psychological perspective and look at the interactions among people's values, attitudes, moods, and emotions to define the experiential nature of trust. They then go on to propose a model for the evolution of trust, differentiating among what they claim are three distinct forms of the trust experience: distrust, conditional trust, and unconditional trust. In so doing, they conceptualize trust as a dynamic experience which allows for shifting from one state to another on the basis of changing values, attitudes, moods and emotions within and among the participants in a trust relationship. The authors' discussion of trust and cooperation in

organizations is particularly pertinent to the interpersonal cooperation and teamwork which is central to the successful functioning of such educational partnerships as professional development schools.

Another paper which examines the "linked dimensions" of trust and distrust models the two factors as "distinct but potentially coexistent mechanisms for managing complexity" (Lewicki, McAllister & Bies, 1998, p. 440). Rather than seeing trust and distrust as one bipolar construct, mutually exclusive and opposite, the authors argue for the multifaceted and multiplex nature of today's network relations and propose that a more realistic and useful way to conceptualize the trust/distrust distinction is to recognize the inconsistent and sometimes conflicting ways in which real people in interdependent relationships actually experience collaborative co-existence. The theories developed by Lewicki, et al. (1998) bring into focus the ambivalence in beliefs, attitudes, and expectations that often arise in complex and developing partnerships where roles are unclear and structure is uncertain.

In his attempt to describe factors influencing trust development, McAllister (1995) distinguishes between two forms of trust: "cognition-based trust" which depends on the trustor's beliefs about the reliability and dependability of the trustee, and "affect-based trust" which derives from reciprocated care and concern. McAllister also discusses the concept of "organizational citizenship behavior" (Organ, 1988; Konovsky & Organ, 1996) and its corollary "altruism" as potentially providing an attributional basis for affect-based trust. This discussion raises the issue of motivation for becoming involved in educational partnerships: self interest vs. altruistic concern.

Addressing the "elusive notion of trust" (Gambetta, 1988, p. ix), Cowles (1997) also differentiates between "cognitive trust," which relies on an assessed probability of trustworthiness, and "trusting behavior" which can be expressed even when an individual has not yet achieved "a cognitive state of trust." Similarly, McKnight, Cummings, and Chervany's (1998) focus on the paradox of initial trust formation seems to contradict the calculative-based trust theorists who describe the rationally derived cost/benefit analyses that they believe underlie the initial decision to trust (Lewicki & Bunker, 1995). It also contradicts the view of knowledge-based trust researchers who theorize the necessity for time and experience to lay the groundwork for interpersonal trust. These theorists suggest a very interesting question, and one germane to the current study, related to the initial expression of trust in early partnerships: Does the observed ability of some individuals to quickly enter into trusting relationships *itself* provide for the facilitation of more widespread and deeper relationships in the future?

Two Useful Models of Trust

Within contemporary trust studies, there are at least two well-developed models which appear to hold promise for a study of trust in the growth and expansion of the professional development school movement. These models conceptualize trust across several dimensions and in so doing deepen and enrich our understanding both of the meaning of trust and its usefulness as a theoretical construct.

Citing early trust researchers (Deutsch, 1958; Gabarro, 1978), Sheppard and Sherman (1998) explore the centrality of "risk," at times irrational, at others a natural and essential aspect

of living, in the conceptualization of trust. Building from Fiske's (1990) anthropological model of social relationships, the authors describe four basic types of trust which vary across two dimensions: dependence/interdependence and shallowness/depth. Each of the resultant types entails distinctly different risks.

Fiske (1990) termed his four basic relational forms 1). Communal Sharing; 2). Authority Ranking; 3). Equality Matching; and 4). Market Pricing. Fiske argues that these four forms are "grammars" for social relations; that they are universal, serving as the basis for "social relations among all people in all cultures and the essential foundation for cross-cultural understanding and intercultural engagement" (1990, p. 25). Sheppard and Sherman (1998) transpose their understanding of trust production onto Fiske's model and the result is a very provocative and richly nuanced means of talking about the forms of dependence, the risks, and the mitigating qualities of trustworthiness which are present in today's complex interpersonal and institutional relationships. Later in this paper, I attempt to use the four distinct grammars of trust identified by Sheppard and Sherman to understand and articulate the stages of growth which occur in educational partnerships.

In a somewhat similar attempt to explore trust from a new and more textured perspective, Das and Teng (1998) focus on strategic alliances and explore the idea of "confidence" as it applies to partner cooperation. In developing their theory, the authors describe trust and control as parallel concepts that combine in several ways to affect the level of confidence experienced by partners within the alliance. Partner cooperation is defined as "the willingness of a partner firm to pursue mutually compatible interests in the alliance rather than act opportunistically" (1998, p.492). It is opposed to opportunism, a focus on one's self-interest rather than on the shared interests within the partnership. While partner cooperation results in such positive values as honesty, commitment, and truthfulness, opportunistic behavior is evidenced by dishonesty, misrepresentation, miscommunication, and lack of commitment.

Because successful partnerships require a high degree of cooperation, the level of confidence in a partner's ability and willingness to sustain such cooperation is very important. In their article, Das and Teng (1998) attempt to systematically examine the concepts of trust, control, and confidence in order to determine the interaction that occurs between the three. They begin by proposing a model which delineates four separate conditions of trust and control: 1). high trust – high control; 2). high trust – low control; 3). low trust – high control; and 4). low trust – low control. Each of these dimensions is accompanied by its own set of outcomes as relates to confidence in partner cooperation.

Having argued for the supplementary relationship between trust and control, Das and Teng (1998) go on to explore the question of whether control mechanisms undermine the trust level in strategic alliances or if, in fact, they might actually help to build mutual trust. To do this, they introduce two different types of control mechanisms: "formal control", with its clearly articulated rules, goals, policies, and procedures; and "social control" with its focus on values, norms, and cultural production. Citing empirical evidence of a positive relationship between social control and trust level (Aulakh, et al., 1997), the authors theorize that while social control mechanisms enhance the level of trust between partners, formal control mechanisms have the potential to undermine the level of trust.

Finally, Das and Teng (1998) turn their attention to building trust in strategic alliances and in so doing articulate four trust-building techniques: 1). Risk Taking; 2). Equity Preservation; 3). Communication; and 4). Interfirm Adaptation. Each of these four has much to say about the development of strategic alliances within the Professional Development School model and will be looked at in detail later in the paper.

The Study

Data for this ethnographic investigation was gathered during the early planning stages and first semester of a newly designed course entitled "Fundamentals of Secondary School Methods." Three years ago, this junior-level course was offered without a field component; students were taught instructional planning and pedagogical skills through case study and role play. The next year a 24-hour field experience was appended to the course; however, because of time constraints, the instructor was able to visit each student in their respective schools (9 students; 8 different field placements) only once during the semester. This failure to effectively combine theory with practice resulted in a less-than-ideal outcome for the students. Student feedback and subsequent discussion with faculty colleagues underscored the need to provide pre-service teachers with a hands-on, activity-based experience and one in which they would be able to engage in reflective dialogue with an instructor who knew first-hand the situations they were encountering.

An obvious solution to the problem was to explore the possibility of holding the class within a high school setting. This approach offered the benefit of immediate application of course-related content within the context of the secondary classroom as well as making it possible for me, as the students' instructor, to share the field experience with my students and to interact with the faculty and staff with whom they would be working. I was aware that this approach was related to the Professional Development School (PDS) model gaining prominence in the educational literature, and wondered how we might begin to move towards building the type of relationship that could lead to such a collaboration.

The first challenge was to locate a site where all students who enrolled in the course could be accommodated and one whose proximity to campus would allow students to travel to and from the school in a timely manner. Anticipating a potentially lengthy search process, I began by writing a letter to the superintendent of Lincolnshire High School (LHS, pseudonym), the large, secondary district nearest to our campus. In this letter, I referred to our state's interest in fostering the development of PDSs and to our institution's desire to explore the possibilities for such partnerships. I outlined a tentative schedule which would allow our students to meet for an extended period off campus each week, and sketched my hopes for how that time could be spent:

> During the class time, students would be introduced to various theories and skills, following which they would then go into individual classrooms to observe these concepts in action. Hopefully at some point in the semester each student would also be given the opportunity to develop and teach a lesson in his or her content area. While this program is still in the planning stages, I am very excited about the potential for much greater and more lasting learning which could result from the immediacy of the theory-practice connection and the opportunity for immediate feedback and focused reflection. (personal correspondence)

I enclosed a copy of the NCATE draft standards for PDS development and said that I would envision our relationship as *Pre-Threshold* in nature. I closed by saying that "we are looking to build even more connected and mutually beneficial relationships between our two schools and to explore various models of collaboration and cross-"cultural" communication. We are very interested in what we all could learn from such an undertaking."

About a week after sending this letter, I received a phone call from the Ms. Marsha Wray, Director of Personnel, informing me that the superintendent had forwarded to her my letter after having approved in principle our plan for collaboration. At that point, he asked her to work together with me to plan the details of the program and to facilitate a smooth transition of the university course into the secondary school setting. Subsequent enquiry and discussion revealed some of the reasons why my request was so quickly accommodated. Active at the state level, the superintendent was quite knowledgeable about recent PDS development and thus very open to exploring such partnerships. In fact, several other area colleges and universities were already pursuing a variety of collaborative relationships with LHS, and thus a pre-existent culture of cooperation allowed my request to be seen in that context. Most important, however, appeared to be my desire to learn from the collaboration and my citing of the NCATE PDS standards which the superintendent saw as a commonly shared interest.

As described in the draft document, the pre-threshold level of a PDS partnership is an important stage during which trust is developed among participants and

> individuals build relationships, mutual values and understandings, and early collaboration between school and university teachers takes shape. Memos of understanding may be transacted about shared expectations and activities in which partners may participate together.

Although the pre-threshold stage frequently lacks institutional commitment, potentially successful sites are distinguished by several important characteristics:

> The partners recognize the need to integrate the four main functions of the PDS: preservice teacher preparation, staff development, research, and support of children's learning. . . . At its core, the PDS is about the integration of these functions. This integration creates new kinds of work for all participants who share the roles of teachers, learners, researchers, and teacher educators.

It was around this understanding that our School of Education and LHS began to explore ways of working together.

That spring and throughout the summer, Marsha Wray and I worked together in person, by phone, and by email to shape the structure and curriculum of the course. I was amazed by the extent of her cooperation and by the frequent reassurances that not only was the new program not an imposition, but that the school was honestly pleased to have us in their building. Since I was so intensely grateful for this opportunity to significantly improve the quality of service we were offering to our students as a result of the partnership, our mutually positive feelings seemed to enhance our working relationship and carry us through the awkward situations that occasionally arose.

One such misunderstanding occurred at the beginning of the semester. Marsha had recruited teacher volunteers to work with the 16 students enrolled in the methods class. In communicating

with these teachers about their responsibilities she did not mention my hope that the students would be able to teach at least one lesson during the semester. Although I had mentioned this in my letter to the superintendent and thought that I had clearly conveyed it to Marsha, she did not recall that aspect of the curriculum and was understandably hesitant about returning to the teachers with additional requests. I was disappointed and felt that this limitation would weaken the overall program. However, I decided not to press the point and simply asked if Marsha had any objection to the students requesting an opportunity to teach after they had been with the teacher for several sessions and felt as if they were beginning to develop a relationship. She felt that this was a reasonable solution to the dilemma and a potential breakdown of trust was thus avoided.

Another relational challenge occurred once the students began to settle into the program. The students' first day at LHS was extremely positive. Marsha welcomed each student by name and distributed packets complete with various informational literature and maps of the large and initially confusing facility. Following an overview of the organizational arrangements and procedures for checking in each week, students toured the school and located the room where they would be working. Returning to our classroom, students wrote their initial impressions, a sampling of which follows:

> Wow! This school is overflowing with resources and with opportunities for staff and students.
> I'm really excited to be here at LHS. They seem so much more willing and excited to have us here than at (another field placement).
> I am so excited about meeting my cooperating teacher. I know that we will be observing for sometime, but I can't wait to really get my feet wet with some teaching experiences.
> I feel overwhelmed and wonder if I really have it in me to teach at a school of this caliber; I hope I do,
> I observed my cooperating teacher through the window.... She seems energetic and excited about her subject. ... This is going to be a blast!
> I was surprised and impressed with how well the school takes care of its teachers.... They expect much yet they give much in return. You can tell this is an intense environment and they strive to be the best. Coming from a town the size of this school, I'm not sure I could have succeeded here.
> I hope that I can connect with my teacher. I want to like her style...but even if I don't I'll be thinking critically about teaching strategies.
> I am just a little scared. I think it is more like I don't want to come out of my comfort zone. All the classes about school are good, but putting it all together and taking that first step forward into being with the students is frightening.
> I am so impressed as to how LHS has opened its doors to us. They are giving us free rein! I'm really very excited and thankful for this opportunity.
> The thing that most impresses me upon my initial contact with LHS is the amount of professionalism. Education is a business. The administrators obviously take their work very seriously; the end result of this is that 98% of graduating seniors go on to four year colleges.

Such comments highlight the initially positive, if at times concerned, response students had to their first day in the field. However, many of these students were quite young and inexperienced, not much older than the students they were encountering in the classroom. I wanted them to conduct themselves in a professional manner, to arrive at school on time and dressed appropriately, to interact with their cooperating teachers with respect, and yet I was also aware of the potential for less than professional behavior once the initial awe had worn off. It was at this point that I had to let go of my students and trust them to behave at LHS in ways that engendered trust and respect. If at times one or two failed to meet their responsibilities, then I had to trust the staff and faculty at LHS to work together with us to remedy the situation. The *risk* inherent in the trusting relationship was very clear to me at this point.

However, all went very smoothly overall. The Trinity students continued to express appreciation for the opportunities they were being given at LHS and the responsibility of "dressing up" and coming onto campus each week seemed to produce a noticeable change in their self-identification. As the semester progressed, I became aware of a significant transition in their thinking, from seeing themselves as students to viewing themselves as teachers. In many ways, this was one of the clearest outcomes of the redesigned methods curriculum. The weekly time spent at LHS included regular interactions with faculty, administration, and staff, lunch eaten in the faculty dining room, opportunities to work with students individually and in groups, access to curriculum resources, and hands-on experiences of grading papers and planning lessons. These and other teacher-like activities allowed the students to complete the student-to-teacher transition far earlier than students in the past. This transformation has multiple benefits including far greater academic motivation now that the student knows where she's heading and sees how what she is learning in the classroom will be used within her profession.

Sixteen students (12 females; 4 males) participated in the newly designed methods course. By the end of the semester they had each clocked over 24 hours during their Thursdays in the field, had met and interacted with such LHS personnel as the Director of Special Services, the school technology trainer, librarians, and the high school principal who spent over two hours with our students, covering such topics as legal issues that affect students and teachers, interviewing and hiring policies, and curriculum design. In addition, students spent their Tuesday classtimes on the university campus discussing the issues of brain-based learning, educational reform, constructivism, unit and lesson planning, and strategies of instruction and assessment. They created individual lesson plans and completed an interdisciplinary theme unit with a classmate from another discipline; they conducted and analyzed taped mini-lessons; they created an instructional display.

During their last class period the students completed a rather extensive reflective response survey which provided us with rich feedback. This feedback was both encouraging and instructive. The students' comments were insightful and specific. They reflected the developmental leap that many of them had taken and their much more immediate identification both with the educational profession in general and with their own specific role as a teacher. Their suggestions for improvement were thoughtful and evidenced careful consideration. Marsha and I found these suggestions particularly useful as we met to review the program and to make changes for the next year.

<u>The Student Survey.</u> The student survey asked students to respond to the following 12 questions:

1. Identify and describe one particularly memorable experience that you had at LHS
2. What are some things you learned at Stevenson that surprised you?
3. Read over the reflections you wrote on your first day at the high school. Have your responses changed over the semester? In what ways? Be specific; cite examples
4. If you were involved in planning the overall format of the program, what changes would you suggest for its improvement?
5. To what extent were you able to relate to students while at LHS? What have you learned about students as a result of your experience?
6. Describe your relationship with the teacher whom you observed. Please take the time to be specific.
7. What was your response to the interactions you had with LHS staff (other than the teacher with whom you worked)? Did you find these interactions to be beneficial?

8. What are some questions that you had during the semester? Were these questions answered? If so, how and in what ways? Have any questions remained unanswered? If so, what are they?
9. In what ways did you grow as a professional through your experience at LHS?
10. What advice would you give students in next year's class for making the most out of the LHS experience?
11. Were the benefits of this collaboration worth the efforts of the LHS staff and the TIU professor? Were they worth the time and effort involved in your driving to the high school each Thursday? Why or why not?
12. Is there anything else you'd like to communicate about your experience at LHS that you did not have a chance to do in the above?

As mentioned above, students wrote extensively around each of these questions. Their answers were transcribed and tabulated (anonymously) by question. Each teacher and staff member who had been involved in the program received copies of these responses. In the space of this paper it would be impossible to convey the depth or the breadth of the students' reflection around the issues raised in the survey. However, several clear themes emerged.

* Memorable experiences: By far the most memorable moments for the students revolved around the interaction with their teacher, followed closely by their interaction with students.

> About halfway through the semester my cooperating teacher let me do the evaluations for the students' oral reports. She went through them with me at the end to see if I was on track and grading them on their level. This experience was exciting and very helpful. It was great to get a teacher's feedback.

> The one moment that I remember is when the teacher sat and talked with me after class and gave me "pointers" that one could not learn in a college classroom. She told me teacher tips.

> My memorable experience was eating lunch in the cafeteria with a group of the history teachers. I was able to discuss with them many elements of teaching – with a little football thrown in.

> One day in class I helped the students edit their poems. I had gotten the chance to know some of the students on a somewhat personal level and a few began to open up to me. I felt as if they were confiding in me, and that we had established a level of trust.

> Two students were talking with me and asked me why I had come. I told them that I was planning to be a teacher and they asked me what math class I was taking. When I told them "Differential Equations" which is about the level of Calculus III, they said that I must be smart, which made me feel good.

* *Surprises*. The students ended their semester with a far more balanced and realistic view of the teaching profession, of students, and of the day-to-day work in schools. The initial awe they felt following their first glimpse of this mega-high school was mediated by the reality they experienced, and they found that they could, in fact, imagine themselves working in this environment.

> I think I learned how complex and yet simple education is. My cooperating teacher just taught, from experience, and the class flowed. It really wasn't all that complex. Even when I taught, it just went, or flew, by me. However, I also learned that training and preparation for teaching are complex and to get to the point where teaching flows in a good way is arduous and lengthy. I think I also learned that teaching is a continual state of learning, a continual state of refining, and reflecting. It is never just static knowledge.

> It surprised me that not all of the teachers had lesson plans. They just sort of "winged it." However I could definitely see the different parts of each lesson plan as they taught.

> I learned that even the kids who come from wealthy families that push them to succeed still get into the same trouble with drugs, alcohol, and sex that the not-so-wealthy kids get into.

The students and the teacher in the room had a great relationship and it really surprised me to see such a fun, comfortable classroom; and yet the students were still learning and doing well.

It surprised me how kids rise to a challenge! My teacher challenged the students to think critically, and he didn't allow them to get away with fluff answers.

As time went on, the structure of the school became less intimidating and more friendly. The students are really just people. Some are stuffy and snobby, but most are just regular people with their own problems. The teachers really do know their stuff, but everyday isn't like a tap dance performance. Even great teachers are sometimes unprepared and most lessons are just average.

The school seemed smaller once I got to know it better. I could even pick kids in my classes out of the crowd.

I now know that I have what it takes to teach in a school like this if I am prepared and relaxed. Kids are kids and they all learn differently no matter what school they're in.

No longer am I fearful when I enter the classroom. I feel qualified to be a teacher. My cooperating teachers taught me a lot about being confident with the students. No longer do I fear I am not ready to teach. After observing the staff and faculty, I realize I am just as "with it" as they seem to be.

A particularly poignant response came from a student who had spent his K-12 years in a less-than-ideal school in the Southwest. As he compared his initial response to LHS with his concluding one, he wrote the following:

(Initial response) I am very impressed with LHS. The computer labs, tutoring centers, and library are larger and have many more resources than an inner city school. I cannot say that great facilities make the student, but the teachers together with the parents do. This will be a great opportunity to learn how to be a teacher. I tutor inmates in Cook County jail in math, science, and English. If tutoring inmates in jail is easier than coming to LHS and tutoring kids who have wealthy families, I am in trouble.

(Answer to question #3) I have seen the faces of the students and from that the library, computer labs, and tutoring centers have come to life. I also have a sense of direction, knowing that maybe I can do it.

* *Suggestions for improvement.* It is no surprise that students can be our best educational consultants. The students in the methods course provided numerous ways in which the program could be improved, and in so doing, highlighted for me many of the things I could have done to make the program even more useful for them. Overall, their comments reflected the need for better planning and more extensive communication, especially with the cooperating teachers. Despite the initial confusion referred to above related to whether or not the students would be given opportunities to teach, most of the students were able to do so. Some, however, had not felt comfortable asking for the opportunity.

I felt like my teacher did not really understand my purpose for being in his classroom. He was friendly and open to any questions I might have, but I think he understood my purpose simply as observation. This is why I didn't feel comfortable asking to have a teaching experience in his classroom. My suggestions would be better communication of purpose and intent.

If I were planning this program, I would sit down with both the LHS planners and the cooperating teachers. I kept getting the feeling that the teachers were not being kept abreast with the objectives of the program.

* *Relationships with students and teachers.* Answers to these questions were mixed and seemed to reflect differing levels of the students' interpersonal skills. Those who are naturally

more personable reported better interpersonal relationships. However, most respondents indicated that a deeper and more positive relationship was forged with their cooperating teacher than was experienced with students. This is not surprising given the limited contact they were able to have with students both within and outside the classroom. As a result of this feedback we have planned to include more opportunities for interaction with students next year. The final, rather lengthy, quote highlights the mutuality that can occur when the relationship really "works."

> I don't feel that I was able to build any relationships with the students. Even the students in my classes were faces without names. I did learn a lot about what they focus on just by observing them as they entered class. I learned that their pop culture is the center of their universe.
>
> I didn't interact with the students very much. They asked me questions sometimes, but other than that I just observed. I learned more about the level of thinking of freshmen. I was able to observe their thought processes and their behavior. It was very helpful
>
> Students were so fun! They were very welcoming and responded well. I got to interact with them quite a bit.
>
> My cooperating teacher was wonderful! She was very effective in the classroom, which made observations informative. Each day I was there, she would brief me on the day's activities and give me samples of the materials. She would involve me in class discussions. She was very willing to answer any questions I had and made a point of making me feel welcome. When I left, she told me how much she would miss me and that I was welcome back anytime. I loved it!
>
> My supervising teacher was nice and friendly, but we did not develop a significant relationship. For the first month she kept forgetting who I was and asked me every Thursday, "Are you a new student?" When she finally figured out that I would come every Thursday, she gave me responsibilities in the classroom (like teaching). However, she did not know what my purpose there was and she did not understand her responsibility to this program. So, I usually just mingled with the students, helped when needed, and observed. We chatted after class; we liked each other, but we never really got past an acquaintance stage.
>
> I didn't like my teacher because of the way she communicated with me. It just seemed to me like she saw me as a nobody and that's the way she treated me. She treated me like I was one of her students. I asked her if there was anything I could do to interact with the kids and she told me that I wasn't prepared yet; that I didn't know what I was doing. I felt she was a very good teacher; however, she did not treat me like I belonged.
>
> I hit it off with my teacher right away. She is a very laid-back person and is young, so she was excited to have me in her classes and in no way did she make me feel like she was "put out" by my presence in her classes. She often invited me to participate in class, and she always took the time to talk with me and tell me about the real world of teaching. She really wanted this to be a positive experience for me. She was often concerned with how I was feeling about sitting in a class just watching. She remembers having to sit in the back of class and observe and how much she hated it, so she went out of her way to make this a fun experience for me. I think my presence in her classroom made a difference in her teaching style as well. I had mentioned to her one day that I didn't think I could put up with all the things she did. She asked me what kind of things, and we spent fifteen minutes talking about the behaviors that I was observing. I noticed that after that conversation she was pulling kids aside after class a lot more often to confront them on their behaviors. It was really neat that I had that kind of effect on her.

* *Relationships with the staff.* Interestingly the *most* positive relationships for the students as a group were with the LHS staff. From the secretary who checked the students in each week to the various staff members who shared with them in a semi-structured classroom setting, Trinity students felt very welcomed and valued within the LHS community.

The school secretary was probably one of the nicest people I have ever met – seriously. She always smiled. She learned all our names and pointed us in the right direction.

Everyone was kind and hospitable to the n^{th} degree! They all went the extra mile to make us feel welcome.

I found the staff to be friendly and all seemed to be excited about our interest in and interaction with LHS. The staff lectures were helpful and relevant to our education and future teacher status. The secretary was very friendly.

I felt that interaction with the staff was a great benefit. They went out of their way to help us and I appreciated that. I went into the resource room and everyone was volunteering information for a project I was working on. I found out more teacher-like things from these people than I thought they would share. It was extremely beneficial.

* *Professional growth.* Of all areas, this seemed to be the one in which all students ended the semester on the same page; 14 of the 16 surveys included specific reference to having made the mental/emotional transition from student to teacher. These young adults had entered LHS with lots of questions, most of which were answered throughout their time there. New questions which surfaced as a result of their field experience were focused and significant. It is very clear that the students grew profoundly as a result of their experience.

I think I see myself more as a teacher now than ever. It's very difficult to make the transition from passive student to active teacher. Being at LHS was a major encouragement and motivational force in making that transition. When we were at LHS we were given the status and respect of teacher. We were treated as professionals and expected to rise to the responsibility.

The best answer I can give you is that for the first time I felt grown up and like a real teacher. I felt different than the students that were walking beside me and it gave me a sense of pride in my chosen field.

I grew just being at LHS. The first day I walked into the class to observe, the students asked me if I were the sub. That surprised me. It helped me to start thinking of myself as a teacher.

I gained more confidence that I could teach. And I also began to interact and feel like a teacher in the teachers' lounge. I would have liked to attend a meeting of the department.

* *Advice.* Students love to pass advice along to those who will follow in their footsteps. These students were no exception. Their comments will be among the first things I introduce within next year's methods class.

Your experience is what you make of it. If you choose to be intimidated by your cooperating teacher and simply sit in the back of the room, then that is all you will ever experience. If you want something more than sitting in the corner, you need to be bold, build a relationship with your teacher, and ask if there is any way you can get more involved in the classroom. The teachers are excited to have you there, and they are all creative enough to get you involved, but you have to want it enough to ask for a better experience.

Be bold! Interact with people, especially the kids. Ask them questions in the last few minutes when they're packing up.

I would advise them to take advantage of LHS's open door. They should look at the resource rooms, library, teachers' lounge, food courts, computer labs. This will help them get a real sense of what the school is about.

Have fun. Don't be shy! Ask lots of questions. Teach! Talk to your teacher. Talk to your peers. Enjoy the program – it's wonderful.

* *Benefits.* All 16 students answered question #11 in the affirmative. Two students were less positive than the others, primarily because they had difficulties with their cooperating teachers. Even they, however, found much to praise in the program. Another frequently mentioned theme was the benefit of being able to discuss the experience with one's peers.

> Yes!! I totally appreciated it! It was so much better than going all the way to (another district) by myself and falling behind in observation hours. It was structured and I appreciated that. I loved interacting with my peers.
>
> Definitely worth the time – the real classroom is the best way to learn and become comfortable in the classroom. I always looked forward to talking with my teacher and learning what she was going through with students that day.
>
> By establishing a collaborative relationship, I felt that each session could be discussed in depth in the classroom. I felt so great being able to discuss these things with my classmates and learn through their experiences as well. The effort was worth it even just to help me develop the confidence to think of myself as a professional.
>
> For me, I wish I could have had a different teacher. However, I learned a lot from the school setting and environment. I learned a lot from watching how students behave. I just wish I could have been in a class that I could realistically see myself in.
>
> Going to LHS together really worked to build community within the secondary education majors.
>
> This is a great idea and I think this collaboration effort will improve through questionnaires such as this one and experience over the years. It is definitely a valuable learning experience.

The Faculty Questionnaire. The faculty questionnaire invited the faculty to respond to 8 questions:

1. What was your personal experience with field placements during your own preservice preparation? Did you find such placements valuable? Why or why not?
2. What prompted you to volunteer to have a Trinity student in your classroom?
3. What did you understand as your role and responsibility towards your Trinity student?
4. Please evaluate the relative success of the time you spent with your student. Given the limited time available, to what extent do you feel you were able to make a difference in his or her understanding and appreciate of the "real world" of public school?
5. Describe the relationship between yourself and your student: Was it primarily superficial and professional, open and personal, or somewhere in between? If possible, please share a specific example to illustrate your response.
6. What were your students' reactions to having a preservice teacher in the class? How do you think they view the many guests and visitors who spend time in their classes?
7. If you were involved in planning the overall format of the Trinity-LHS program, what changes, from your perspective, would you suggest for its improvement?
8. Would you be willing to work with another Trinity student in the future? Why or why not?

Ten of the 17 teachers involved in the collaboration returned their questionnaires. Of the seven who did not, one chose not to complete the survey because of the "poor experience" she had with her student. As with the student surveys, these responses offered valuable feedback which will assist us in improving the program in its second year.

* *Reasons for serving as a cooperating teacher.* Several teachers referred to their own experience in the field as a reason for offering to have a student in their classroom. Either their program had been positive, and they wanted to recreate this for the preservice teacher, or it was

minimal and not very useful, and they saw having a student as a way to benefit the students' preparation. For the most part, teachers joined the program out of a sense of personal altruism, professional duty, and/or the overall culture of LHS as an open, helping institution.

> I believe the program is important and helpful to the student. Too many students when I was in college got to the student teacher part and decided they did not want to be in the classroom.
>
> I did a lot of observation of teachers at different schools and at different levels. I also was able to get some teaching experience before I student taught. I found these experience to be very worthwhile, and so when my director asked if it would be OK – I said "fine."
>
> We had very little exposure to "real" classrooms prior to student teaching. We did some tutoring in the community and spent one or two days in the classroom. These times were helpful and informative, but much too limited. I volunteered because I thought it would be nice to be able to be the person responsible for giving someone else an "authentic" experience and help them in this way.
>
> Because I believe in giving back to the profession.

* *Role and responsibility*. Here the teachers evidenced the same confusion as did the students, highlighting the importance of making sure that all key aspects of a program are fully communicated *in writing* prior to the start of the semester. Initial expectations exert a powerful pull on one's experience and when not met, can cause uncertainty, disappointment, and perhaps even withdrawal. Only two faculty members alluded to providing the student with the opportunity to teach a lesson or move beyond the observation stage.

> To allow them to come into the classroom and observe a lesson one time per week
>
> To model what an effective and professional teacher does on a daily basis
>
> To show proper teaching techniques and strategies; to offer advice/suggestions when appropriate and to answer questions honestly.
>
> This I feel was not clearly communicated. I did not know if the student was to observe or to teach lessons. This I failed to recognize and understand.
>
> Inspiration – and the student from Trinity provided me with it!

* *Making a difference*. Some ambivalence appears in the faculty responses to question #4. A number of the faculty have had student teachers in the past and thus evaluated this less intensive experience as only moderately successful. A few responses seemed a bit wistful, as if the pace and stress of daily life prevented the teacher from offering the student all that she might have wished.

> I feel that the student was able to have a somewhat authentic experience, although it could have been better with some mutual planning (between the student and me) and with a more regular schedule.
>
> The interview was a good idea. This allowed us to talk about the realities of teaching.
>
> We didn't talk much – our most in-depth exchange was via email and I'm not sure what she was able to observe or perceive.

I think the students' experience would have been more effective if there had been more structure to their observations – for example, maybe each week they would be focusing on a different aspect of the teaching experience. Should take notes!

I spent little time with him at all. It was a casual "hello" or "goodbye." We seldom talked about anything. I never had the chance to get to know him.

It was a very positive experience. I think it is important for students to see what happens in the classroom and have the opportunity to follow this through with one teacher on a regular basis.

* *The teachers' relationship with their students.* Despite the students' sense that they had positively connected with their teachers, the majority of teachers described their sense of the relationship as rather superficial and "professional at best." The rest reported the relationship to be "somewhere in between." Time seemed to be the major factor as well as in two cases the failure of the student to be proactive in seeking out a relationship.

Very superficial. She arrived just when class was beginning and we didn't talk before or after.

It was professional at best. He happened to be in a class with several disruptive students, and I never had a chance to talk to him much.

Primarily professional – not a lot of time to talk.

Somewhere in between. It was nice to be able to talk about and share some of my successes and failures and to offer advice on how to deal with certain situations. I liked being able to answer any questions she had.

Probably somewhere in between. We didn't have a great deal of time to talk, but we did share common interests in athletics and both having attended small, Christian liberal arts colleges.

* *Suggestions for improvement.* Here again the verdict was unanimous. Each of the teachers who responded to this question indicated the need for more prior planning and involvement in the overall structure of the program. This is one of the major changes we intend to make in the program next year.

I feel that there should be some preliminary meetings to discuss the objectives and outcomes for both the student and the teacher (myself). I also think it would be helpful for the student to be involved in either planning or teaching a lesson.

Incorporate more opportunities to share. Get students involved more with lesson planning. It seems like it would be more beneficial to have students come for a few weeks but every day vs. once a week. Then they can see the whole unit progress.

More information on what the teacher is supposed to do and what the student is suppose to do. I'm not sure how effective the observation was.

Opportunity for the teacher and preservice teacher to have more time to discuss what went on and how the preservice teacher viewed the classroom activities and lessons.

* *Would you do it again?* Eight of the teachers responded very positively to this question. One responded that he didn't know. "It would have to be under better circumstances with more information." The other answered that in the immediate future he would be unable to do so since he was having a student teacher. Despite the miscommunication and frustrations, these teachers

seemed to find the experience of working with a preservice teacher early in the preparation process to be beneficial.

> I enjoyed having a student in the classroom, and I think it made me plan a little better and think through each day's activities more thoroughly.
>
> It is a very enjoyable and rewarding experience.

The Program Planners' Interactions. From the outset of our interaction, Marsha and I appeared to have an extremely cordial relationship. In terms of the trust literature discussed above, one might suggest that we are both predisposed to trust in novel or unfamiliar situations. Since she had been instructed and empowered by her superintendent to work together with me on the proposed program, and since she is a highly capable and gifted planner, her assistance was invaluable in providing us the opportunity to begin our program with a minimum of procedural or organizational problems. We both correspond effectively through email, and wrote over 25 notes and memos to each other over the course of the semester, generally focused on scheduling and curriculum issues.

Marsha took responsibility for everything on the LHS side of the collaboration. In the summer she contacted the program directors who in turn gathered the volunteers to participate with us in the program. Marsha worked with me through the planning stages of the course, giving feedback on the curriculum as it appeared on the syllabus. In fact, when I later asked her to explore with me reasons why our collaboration seemed to begin so smoothly, one of the key factors for her in those early days was the connection she saw in the syllabus between my personal educational philosophy and that of the administration and faculty at LHS. Mentioning the superintendent's initial approval, Marsha went on to explain:

> The next thing we got from you was that very detailed syllabus which just happened to outline some things that we feel real strongly about philosophically. . . We looked at that and thought "yes, well, we concur with all that," so we knew that by setting this up it was going to be wonderful because your mindset was that same as ours and it was going to flow. And, basically, other than a few little bumps here and there, that's exactly what happened.

In addition to coordinating the selection of participating faculty, Marsha also contacted those members of the staff who could provide insight into some of the special topics I hoped to raise with my students during our time in the field: technology, special needs, behavioral problems, disciplinary concerns, legal and ethical considerations, etc. These special presentations proved to be a highlight of the students' time at LHS, in part, I believe, because of the way that Marsha communicated to the staff the purpose of their involvement with our students.

One initial challenge which neither Marsha nor I knew quite how to address was the mismatch between Trinity's class schedule and that of LHS. It quickly became apparent that my plan of having the students all together in a classroom for the first hour and then out in the classrooms for the second hour was not going to work. Some students were with their teachers during the first hour; some during the second (some for both). This meant that the presentations by LHS staff would need to be done twice in order to accommodate the split schedule. It is easy to imagine that in some circumstances such a problem could create dissonance between the two collaborating groups. However, Marsha and I were both committed to making *our* program work, and so I adjusted my syllabus and Marsha found a way of getting the staff presenters to

offer back-to-back sessions. We were not surprised by the logistical problems which surfaced from time to time and thus were both willing and able to make appropriate, and at times quite creative adjustments to accommodate them.

One unexpected factor that could have adversely affected our program was the "tyranny of the urgent," which in mid-semester made it very difficult for either Marsha or me to communicate. Both of us were involved in highly stressful and time-consuming responsibilities in our respective institutions. I found it particularly difficult to prepare for my classes and to look farther ahead than the next hour. During this time we both had to trust in our earlier preparations and in the goodwill which had developed between us. In most cases, prior planning ensured that the schedule was followed, and when minor glitches arose, we were able to be patient with each other as we sought to remedy problems on the spur of the moment. By this point in the semester, the collaboration had become more well known throughout the campus and the positive relationship that existed between Marsha and myself appeared to spread out to the staff with whom we routinely interacted. Thus, if a door was locked or the school was on a shortened schedule, someone on staff quickly responded to our special needs.

In our final meeting of the year, Marsha and I discussed the students' responses to the program and brainstormed ways to refine and improve the collaboration for the second year. The audiotape of this meeting underscores the cordiality and congruence that had grown between us throughout the semester. There is much agreement, laughter, and completing of each other's sentences. We began our meeting with the one negative note which sounded in the students' surveys: their sense that the teachers were not clear about what was expected of them. I found myself anxious put their comments into perspective and to assure Marsha that the students' overall response was extremely positive. I did not want her to see their criticism of this one element as the primary outcome of the program and perhaps react negatively to the students. Marsha replied,

> Just the opposite. I was concerned that they were disappointed. I think that when they walk into a building for the first time they should feel very welcome and anxious to be here, and we *really* wanted them to feel that way.... So when they felt that when they went into the classrooms for the first time that the teacher wasn't really sure what to do with them, I felt bad about that. Those kids should have immediately had a sense of belonging and fitting in...and I think, particularly when you're looking at a school this size, we make such an effort so people don't feel shut out...that was exactly the thing I didn't want them to feel.

This mutual concern for each other's feelings and the desire to own our part of the blame was one of the many ways in which our growing relationship helped us to find ways to work together rather than to pull apart.

We discussed some of the positive features of the collaboration. I highlighted the students' identity shift from student to teacher, and Marsha commented that the program "sets them up nicely for student teaching because much of what they went through in this period with us is what a lot of them go through in their student teaching environment, and then so much time can be wasted in that transition." We agreed that better communication was needed with the teachers, and planned together to start next year's program with a group meeting in which all of us who will be participating work together to share ideas and ensure that the expectations have been clearly understood. We laughed together about how little we knew at the outset of the semester. "But it was fun!" We just plunged in. We had an opportunity to try something, and

we did. It was all new, but "you have to start someplace." We agreed that we learned so much in the process and now what was needed was to take what we'd learned and apply it in order to improve the collaboration for the future.

Finally, I asked Marsha to talk about the factors that go into making a positive partnership, one that truly works. "What drew you and the rest of the school to our program?"

> First off, it's rooted right in the philosophy of our district. The superintendent is someone who really subscribes to this concept he calls 'learning communities.' He's published several books about it; he speaks on it. We just believe that we learn so much from each other. So when we look at partnerships, it's not so much about what we will get back. Rather, it's giving us an opportunity to function with yet another extension of the field of education.

Then I asked what I might have done which could have put them off our program or made them question their willingness to work together with us?

> When you came in and introduced the program to us, even though there were the unknowns that come just by doing something for the first time, you *did* have a pretty clear idea about what you were hoping that your students would do and that syllabus that you presented to us was pretty clear in terms of where you were going and what you were hoping to accomplish with that.
>
> The other thing that I think really helped, and this may seem real silly to you – your kids were here when they were supposed to be; they did what they were supposed to do. Now I know that sounds silly, but we *have* had situations where people have said 'yeah, we'd like to send some people over for observations' and they either don't show up or they show up late or they think they are operating on their own timetable – and that's a great way to create animosity in an organization where you've got 4,000 students to educate.

As a result of this meeting, both Marsha and I came away with a sense that we had cemented our initial relationship and moved it to the next level. We agreed that we were looking forward to getting an early start on our planning for the second year of our program.

Discussion

The trust literature cited above offers valuable perspectives on the development of trust in collaborative partnerships. Whether they are called strategic alliances, joint ventures, multinational mergers, or professional development schools, such collaborations share the common need for positive early interactions that foster rather than impede future cooperation. New endeavors can be risky. At times it takes one individual (or group) willing to make the first move to open the channels of communication leading to a productive affiliation. A sense of self, of mutuality, and an ability to work across cultures are all necessary factors in the development of healthy trust relationships.

The dispositional theory of trust as presented by Bigley and Pearce (1998) helps us to understand the importance of individual personality issues within the initial stages of a collaboration. It seems evident that both Marsha Wray and I were predisposed to believe the best about each other. Despite the novelty of the situation, we both actively looked for ways in which we could begin to forge an alliance. In discussing these early days some months later, we agreed that we both tend to enter new situations with a confident and hopeful outlook. It is only as circumstances or people begin to disappoint us or take advantage of us that we begin to close down and withdraw. We seem to have learned the value of choosing short term, initial trust as a

means of exploring the possibility of future long-term rewards. This shared dynamic seemed to work to the advantage of our early partnership venture.

As we looked at the possible ways in which our program might have been adversely affected, we echoed the focus on distrust, conditional trust, and unconditional trust which appears in the work of Jones and George (1998) and Lewicki, McAllister and Bies (1998). In the early stages of a collaboration sometimes even things which may seem "silly" can derail an otherwise positive beginning. As Marsha stated, had our students failed to arrive on time, they would have delivered a tacit message of irresponsibility and lack of commitment which could easily have resulted in distrust. We may have decided to continue the program, but work would have been needed to repair the breach in that aspect of our partnership. We may have chosen to maintain a "trusting behavior" even though the students' actions had kept us from achieving a "cognitive state of trust" (Cowles, 1997), but a change in the students' actions would have been required to maintain that trusting behavior over time.

Not only was an initial relationship being formed on the macro-level between Trinity and LHS, but micro-level relationships similar to that developing between Marsha and myself were also occurring between the students and their cooperating teachers. In some cases, these relationships were mutually positive and beneficial. In others, the participants were experiencing only moderate levels of mutuality and trust. In still others, fortunately only one or two, the student and teacher had failed to connect, and the relationship which had begun on an initially positive note had degenerated to the point where neither partner saw any reason to work on it further. In the beginning stages of a PDS partnership, the sum total of these micro-level relationships can produce a powerful influence on the proceedings of the overall collaboration. While creating a culture, participants must pay careful attention to each element within the process.

Earlier in this paper we raised the question: Does the observed ability of some individuals to quickly enter into trusting relationships *itself* provide for the facilitation of more widespread and deeper relationships in the future? As we together explored this question, Marsha and I concluded that in our case this appeared to be true. Our initial willingness to expect the other to be trustworthy was clearly not based on prior knowledge; we scarcely knew each other. Rather, each of us independently chose to act *as if* the other could be trusted. Because of this, we did not attempt to impose constraining rules or cumbersome restrictions on one another. Perhaps because of our basic "faith in humanity" (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998) we found that we preferred to exhibit confidence in the good will of the other. This trusting stance led us to believe that there were safety nets built into the system that would support us should problems arise.

The two useful models of trust introduced earlier (Sheppard and Sherman, 1998; Das and Teng, 1998) offer interesting and instructive models for conceptualizing the development of trust in early collaborative arrangements. The four grammars of trust outlined by Sheppard and Sherman (1998) combine the concepts of dependence, risk, and quality of trustworthiness to provide an understanding of the varieties and dimensions of the trusting relationship that change and develop over time. While one would need to read their entire paper to grasp the complexity of their argument, it is interesting to see how the authors identify the gradually intensifying forms of dependence, the accompanying risks, and the qualities of trustworthiness which appear

to mitigate the risks (see Table 1 below). They liken the forms of dependence to a dating relationship: Shallow dependence is similar to a first date, deep dependence to continued dating, shallow interdependence to engagement, and deep interdependence to marriage. At each stage of the relationship the depth or the interdependence reaches a critical point that signals its transformation to the next level. Often a change in dependence is marked by a commitment that formalizes the new aspect of the relationship.

Table 1

Form of Dependence	Risks	Qualities of Trustworthiness
Shallow dependence	Indiscretion, unreliability	Discretion, reliability, competence
Deep dependence	Cheating, abuse, neglect, self-esteem	Integrity, concern, benevolence
Shallow interdependence	Poor coordination	Predictability, consistency
Deep interdependence	Misanticipation	Foresight, intuition, empathy

(Sheppard & Sherman, 1998, p. 6)

It is interesting to attempt to transpose the stages of PDS development onto Sheppard and Sherman's model. The pre-threshold stage described earlier in this paper appears to include the first two levels of dependence; shallow dependence marking the initial attempts of university and school faculties to work together, and deep dependence marking the early partnership's increasing involvement in preservice teacher preparation, staff development, research , and support of children's learning. Once the partners agree to the institutional commitments of the high stakes PDS relationship (threshold stage), they have become interdependent. Over time, the agreements, commitments, and working relationships made by the partnership strengthen the initial interdependence, eventually moving it towards the deeper level of interdependence evidenced by the quality attainment stage.

A second interesting model has been proposed by Das and Teng (1998) who look at strategic alliances in terms of two parallel concepts of trust and control and how these work together to generate confidence. Delineating four separate conditions of trust and control, their model allows us to suggest differing dynamics for each of the conditions and apply them to the PDS setting. For example, when trust is high and control is low, one might expect to see a considerable amount of risk-taking and an increased incidence of out-of-the-box thinking. However, as Das and Teng suggest, the confidence level here may be only moderate, since there are also no structural safeguards to offer protection against lone-ranger-type behavior. Similarly in the low trust-high control condition, one might expect to see many rules, standards, and assessments that provide the necessary safeguards, but the partnership is lacking in benevolence and reliability. Again, the confidence level is moderate.

A quite different situation occurs in a low trust-low control setting. This dimension *could* apply to a pre-threshold PDS partnership where neither institution has truly engaged in the process of building a lasting relationship. It is likely that the resultant confusion, tentativeness, and possibility for opportunistic behavior on the part of one or both of the partners would eventually lead to the dissolution of the collaboration. The confidence level in such a setting

would be very low. In high trust-high control settings, trusting partners develop mutually agreed-upon control mechanisms (generally more social than formal) which in turn specify expectations and ensure cooperation. Although risk-taking with its potential for creative outcomes may be somewhat minimized, it could also be argued that the protection offered by these control mechanisms (frequent meetings, written reports, standards; shared goals, values, and norms) would keep all participants on track, allowing them to work together towards a common purpose.

As they explore ways to build trust in strategic alliances, Das and Teng (1998) observe that more attention has traditionally been given to the building of control mechanisms than to the intentional development of trust. To remedy this situation, they suggest four trust-building techniques that they believe will allow for the most efficient and effective production of inter-firm trust: risk-taking, equity preservation, communication, and intercultural adaptation. It is helpful to apply these strategies to the stages of building trust within PDS collaborations.

Risk appears to be a necessary element of early alliance-making. In order to develop trust, one must be willing to take a risk. Taking risks implies trust, and when one party acts in a trusting manner, the other tends to respond in kind. If two groups (e.g., a school and a university) start with a limited investment, they can incrementally increase their commitment over time as a result of ongoing experiences. But it is important to choose one's partner wisely. A reputation for honesty, fairness, and trustworthiness allows the initially trusting party to take that initial risk.

A second suggestion for building trust within a collaborative is to ensure the maintenance of equity and fairness within the gradually developing structure of the partnership. Since the school often initially and more naturally provides a greater service to the university (shared facilities, faculty, students, etc.), a conscious effort must be made on the part of the university to look actively for ways that they can creatively benefit the partner school. While this may not appear to be a problem in the early stages when everyone is excited about the novelty of the venture, over time, a lack of equity threatens to undermine mutual trust.

Almost everyone agrees on the role of open, honest, and timely communication to foster trust development. In our collaboration with LHS, this challenge to maintain open channels of communication in hectic times required sensitivity, flexibility, and a willingness to work within a sometimes less-than-ideal situation. In the one case where a student and a teacher failed to connect, lack of communication was THE major factor. In the early stages of a partnership, taking time to communicate frequently and clearly one's gratitude and appreciation oils the gears that help collaboration to run smoothly.

An often overlooked factor in early trust development, and one which we found absolutely essential, is the ability to make accommodations. It is often necessary to adjust one's own behavioral pattern so that it more easily connects with that of one's partner. When LHS and Trinity made the decision to plunge into our project to see where it might take us, we set up tentative working arrangements which later in the semester needed to be adjusted. Had either of us been too rigid in our expectations, we would have created tension and possibly even potentially fatal misunderstandings. Bringing together two such different cultures as a university and a high school requires a willingness and an ability on the part of both sides to

make adaptations which can lead to deeper understanding and more productive organizational arrangements.

Conclusion

The primary goal of this paper is to examine the early stages of trust development in a pre-threshold stage PDS collaboration and to articulate some of the factors that contribute to positive working relationships in initial interpersonal and inter-institutional encounters. Accordingly, it examines the experiences and perceptions of preservice teachers, high school faculty, and others involved in the partnership, and proposes that a predisposition to trust, responsibility in following through with one's obligations, and a willingness to allow for minor indiscretions provide a basis for increased cooperation and further involvement. A secondary goal is to highlight the existence of a rich body of trust literature currently being produced by theorists within the organizational sciences. It is suggested that educational researchers would gain insights from a study of these recent models, insights which could then be related to the wide variety of partnerships operative in education today. Although trust is frequently discussed as vital for productive collaborative relationships, lack of a rigorous understanding of what is meant by the term impedes our ability to encourage behaviors that support and sustain it.

References Cited

Aulakh, P. S., Kotabe, M., & Sahay, A. (1997). Trust and performance in cross-border marketing partnerships. In P. W. Beamish & J. P. Killing (Eds.), *Cooperative strategies: Volume 1. North American perspectives* (pp. 163-196). San Francisco: New Lexington Press.

Bercik, J. T. (1991a). University/district apprenticeship model development. Unpublished paper.

Bercik, J. T. (1991b). School based/university collaborative effort: A pre service model. Unpublished paper.

Bhattacharya, R., Devinney, T. M., & Pillutla, M. M. (1998). A formal model of trust based on outcomes. *Academy of Management Review, 23 (3),* 459-473.

Bigley, G. A., & Pearce, J. L. (1998). Straining for shared meaning in organization science: Problems of trust and distrust. *Academy of Management Review, 23 (3),* 405-422.

Chevalier, M. (1994). Developing a trusting community: Dilemmas in ESL adult instruction. *Adult Basic Education, 4 (1),* 3-18.

Clemson, S. (1990). Four models of collaborative teacher education: A comparison of success factors and maturation. *Action in Teacher Education, 12,* 31-17

Cowles, D. L. (1997). The role of trust in customer relationships: Asking the right questions. *Management Decision, 35 (3-4),* 273-283.

Crawford, S. (1993). Building a school-university relationship: The emerging role of clinical professors. *Contemporary Education, 64,* 255-257.

da Costa, J. L. (1993). A study of teacher collaboration in terms of teaching-learning performance. Unpublished paper.

da Costa, J. L. (1995). Teacher collaboration: The roles of trust and respect. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April, 1995.

Das, T. K. & Teng, B-S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of Management Review, 23 (3),* 491-513.

De Boer, A. (1995). *Working together: The art of consulting & communicating.* Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Deiro, J. A. (1996). *Teachig with heart: Making healthy connections with students.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution (2),* 265-279.

Duffy, G. G. (1994). Professional development schools and the disempowerment of teachers and professors. *Phi Delta Kappan,* _____

Erikson, E. H. (2959). *Identity and the life cycle.* New York: International Universities Press.

Ferris, C. H., Jr. (1994). A program for building trust between teachers and administrators to enhance the supervision/evaluation process. Unpublished paper.

Fiske, A. P. (1990). Relativity within Moose culture: Four incommensurable models for social relationships. *Ethos, 18,* 180-204.

Francis, R. W. (1992). Issues in establishing rural professional development schools. Unpublished paper.

Gabarro, J. J. (1978). The development of trust, influence, and expectations. In A. G. Athos & J. J. Gabarro (Eds.), *Interpersonal behavior: Communicaton and understanding in relationships* (pp. 290-303). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gambetta, D. (1988). Can we trust trust? In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust:: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations* (pp. 213-238). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Goodlad, J. I. (1988). School-university partnerships for educational renewal: Rationale and concepts. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns*, (pp. 3-31). New York: Teachers College Press.

Heil, L. (1986). A university faculty member's perspective: Lesson learned from a partnership experience. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April, 1986.

Higgins, K. M., & Merickel, M. (1997). The promise and the promises: Partnerships from a university perspectiveacher Educator, 32, *165-184*.

Holmes Group, (1990). *Tomorrow's Schools*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review, 23 (3),* 531-547.

Koehn, D. (1996). Should we trust in trust? *American Business Law Journal, 34(2),* 183-203.

Konovsky, M. A. and Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17 (3),* 253-267.

Levine, M. (1997). Can professional development schools help us achieve what matters most? *Action in Teacher Education , 19 (2),* 63-73.

Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. B. (1995) Trust in relationships: A model of trust development and decline. In B. B. Bunker & J. Z. Rubin (Eds.), *Conflict, cooperation and justice* (pp. 133-173). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review 23 (3),* 438-459.

Lewison M., & Holliday, S. (1997). Control, trust, and rethinking traditional roles: Critical elements in creating a mutually beneficial university-school partnership. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 24,* 105-126.

Martin, J. R. (1992) *The schoolhome*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 38 (1),* 24-60.

McKnight, D. H., Cummings, L. L., & Chervany, N. L. (1998). Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review, 23 (3),* 473-491.

Mellinger, G. D. (1956) Interpersonal trust as a factor in communication. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, (52),* 304-309.

Million, S. K., & Vare, J. W. (1997). The collaborative school: A proposal for authentic partnership in a professional development school. *Phi Delta Kappan, 78 (9),* 710-713.

Morgan, T. (1997). Transformation through interdependence: Learning to collaborate. Unpublished paper.

NCATE (1997). Draft standards for professional development schools. NCATE: www.ncate.org/projects/pds/outline.html.

Noddings, N. (1988). An ethic of caring and its implications for instructional arrangements. *American Journal of Education, 96 (2),* 215-230.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books

Riordan,G. P. (1995). Teachers' perceptions of collaboration and clinical supervision. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April, 1995.

Riordan, G. P., & da Costa, J. L. (1996). Self initiated high school teacher collaboration. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April, 1996.

Rothberg, R. A. (1984). Trust development: The forgotten leadership skill. *NASSP Bulletin, 68 (476),* 18-22

Rotter, J. (1971). Generalized expectancies for interpersonal trust. *American Psychologist, 26,* 443-452.

Rotter, J. (1980). Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness and gullibility. *American Psychologist, 35,* 1-7.

Schlechty, P. C., & Whitford, B. L. (1993). Shared problems and shared vision: Organic collaboration. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns,* (pp. 191-204). New York: Teachers College Press.

Selke, M. J. (1996). Cultural analysis of school-university partnershlps: Assessing dynamics and potential outcomes. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, February 23, 1996.

Shapiro, S. P. (1987). The social control of impersonal trust. *American Journal of Sociology, 93,* 623-658.

Sheppard, B. H., & Sherman, D. M. (1998). The grammars of trust: A model and general implications. *Academy of Management Review, 23 (3),* 422-438.

Smith, S. D. & Auger, K. (1986). Conflict or cooperation? Keys to success in partnerships in teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education, 7 (4),* 1-9.

Stump, C. S. (1993). School-university collaboration: A year-long effort. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 28,* 51-58.

Teitel, L. (1997). Changing teacher education through professional development school partnerships: A five-year follow-up study. *Teachers College Record, 99 (2),* 311-334.

Thorkildsen, R., & Stein, M. R. S. (1996). Fundamental characteristics of successful university-school partnerships. *School Community Journal, 6 (2),* 79-92.

Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). *Academy of Management Review 23, (3),* 513-531.

Wiedmer, T. L. (1995). Instructional improvement: The goal of clinical supervision. *Teacher Educator, 30 (3),* 6-18.